agreements with DOE in technical areas which are unrelated to the Board's oversight authority. While these contracts may not represent a potential or actual conflict of interest regarding the substance of the technical effort, their total value constitutes a significant portion of the firm's gross revenues.

(2) Guidance. A conflict of interest may exist due to the firm's substantial pecuniary dependence upon DOE. Consequently, the Board may question the likelihood that the contractor would provide unbiased opinions, conclusions, and work products because of this extensive financial relationship. The Board will review and consider the extent of the firm's financial dependence on DOE, the nature of the proposed Board contract, the need by the Board for the services and expertise to be provided by the firm and the availability of such services and expertise elsewhere, and whether the likelihood of the firm's providing objective technical evaluations and opinions to the Board could be influenced in view of its DOE relationship. Based on this analysis, the Board may either determine that there is no conflict and make the award, waive the conflict if one is identified and establish procedures to mitigate it where possible, or disqualify the offeror.

(f) Circumstances—(1) Facts. Board discovers that a firm competing for a contract has a substantial business relationship in technical areas unrelated to the Board's oversight authority with a contractor operating a defense nuclear facility under a DOE contract. Similar to the situation described in paragraph (e) of this section, the total value of the contracts with the DOE contractor constitutes more than half of the firm's gross revenues, even though those contracts do not represent a potential or actual conflict of interest regarding any of the particular matters to be covered by the contract with the Board.

(2) Guidance. The firm's substantial financial and business dependence upon the DOE contractor may give rise to a conflict of interest, in that the likelihood of the firm's rendering impartial, objective assistance or advice to the Board may be impaired by its extensive

financial relationship with the DOE contractor. In this situation, the Board will review and consider the nature of the proposed Board contract, the need by the Board for the services and expertise to be provided by the firm and the availability of such services and expertise elsewhere. The Board will also review and consider the extent of the firm's financial dependence on the DOE contractor and whether the firm would be impartial and objective in providing technical evaluation and opinions to the Board, especially on matters in which the DOE contractor is involved, notwithstanding the relationship with the DOE contractor. Based on this analysis, the Board may determine that there is no actual conflict of interest and make the award. Alternatively, if the Board identifies a conflict that cannot be avoided, the Board may determine to waive the conflict in the best interests of the United States, with or without the establishment of procedures to mitigate the conflict, or it may disqualify the offer-

[57 FR 44652, Sept. 29, 1992; 58 FR 13684, Mar. 12, 1993]

## §1706.10 Remedies.

The refusal to provide the certificate, or upon request of the contracting officer the additional written statement, required by §§ 1706.6 and 1706.7 in connection with an award shall result in disqualification of the offeror for that award. The nondisclosure or misrepresentation of any relevant information may also result in the disqualification of the offeror for that award. If such nondisclosure or misrepresentation by an offeror or contractor is discovered or occurs after award, or in the event of breach of any of the restrictions contained in this part, the Board may terminate the contract for convenience or default, and the offeror or contractor may also be disqualified by the Board from consideration for subsequent Board contracts and be subject to such other remedial actions as provided by law or the contract.

[57 FR 44652, Sept. 29, 1992; 58 FR 13684, Mar. 12, 1993]